DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 895 RE 001 697

Elementary Reading Centers; Milwaukee, Wisconsin. It Works.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Div. of Compensatory Education.

Report No-OE-37031

Pub Date [69]

Note-13p.

Available from-Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (OE-37031, $.20)

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.

Descriptors-*Disadvantaged Youth, Evaluation, *Intermediate Grades, Methodology, *Reading Centers, Reading Materials, *Remedial Reading

In 15 Milwaukee, Wisconsin, reading centers disadvantaged children from grades 4 through 8 received remedial reading instruction and wide reading opportunities through small group instruction. Students remained in the program for varying periods, ranging from a few weeks to 7 months. A diagnostic approach was used to identify the specific needs of each pupil. Activities, materials, and equipment used to meet these needs are listed. Evaluation consisted of administering the California Reading Test (silent reading) and the Wide Range Achievement Test (oral reading). The educational and experiential backgrounds and the responsibilities of the personnel involved in the program are presented. Additional evaluation indexes, modifications and suggestions, and budgetary information are included. References are noted. (RT)

ED028895
OE-37031
OE-BESE
TITLE I

ELEMENTARY READING CENTERS
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

IT WORKS

AE 001 697

Elementary Program
in Compensatory Education 2

1. Preschool Program in Compensatory Education

   Preschool Program, Fresno, California OE–37034
   Infant Education Research Project, Washington, D.C. OE–37033
   Early Childhood Project, New York City OE–37027
   Perry Preschool Project, Ypsilanti, Michigan OE–37035
   Diagnostically Based Curriculum, Bloomington, Indiana OE–37024
   Academic Preschool, Champaign, Illinois OE–37041

2. Elementary Program in Compensatory Education

   More Effective Schools, New York City OE–37042
   Intensive Reading Instructional Teams, Hartford, Connecticut OE–37038
   After School Study Centers, New York City OE–37036
   Self-Directive Dramatization Project, Joliet, Illinois OE–37037
   Project Concern, Hartford, Connecticut OE–37030
   Elementary Reading Centers, Milwaukee, Wisconsin OE–37031
   School and Home Program, Flint, Michigan OE–37023
   Programmed Tutorial Reading Project, Indianapolis, Indiana OE–37029
   Speech and Language Development Program, Milwaukee, Wisconsin OE–37028

3. Elementary-Secondary Program in Compensatory Education

   Homework Helper Program, New York City OE–37025
   Communication Skills Center Project, Detroit, Michigan OE–37039

4. Secondary Program in Compensatory Education

   Junior High Summer Institutes, New York City OE–37026
   Project R–3, San Jose, California OE–37040
   College Bound Program, New York City OE–37032

For information on any of the booklets listed, please write to Information Officer, Division of Compensatory Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202

IT WORKS

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ELEMENTARY READING CENTERS
MILWAUKEE

One of a Series of

Successful Compensatory Education Programs

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Robert H. Finch, Secretary

Office of Education
Peter P. Muirhead, Acting Commissioner

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402 - Price 20 cents

FOREWORD

This project report is part of an independent study of selected exemplary programs for the education of disadvantaged children completed by the American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, Palo Alto, Calif., under contract with the U.S. Office of Education.

The researchers report this project significantly improved the educational attainment of the disadvantaged children involved. Other communities, in reviewing the educational needs of the disadvantaged youngsters they serve, may wish to use this project as a model - adapting it to their specific requirements and resources.

Division of Compensatory Education
Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education

THE ELEMENTARY READING CENTERS OF MILWAUKEE

Introduction

Fifteen elementary schools were provided with reading centers in which remedial reading instruction and wide reading opportunities were offered. Reading center teachers worked with six to eight pupils at a time; each group received about 30 minutes' instruction a day, 5 days a week, usually for one semester.

The pupils were in fourth through eighth grades and were from poverty areas of the city, in which high population density and mobility prevailed. Although the centers were in public schools, non-public school pupils attended too. Priority was given to pupils of average or above average IQ who were a year or more retarded in reading. Both Negro and Caucasian pupils were participants; more boys than girls were included.

The Milwaukee Public Schools have operated a reading improvement program in numerous centers since 1947, including the majority of the schools described here. This project operated in the 1966-67 school year, although different schools were served in the two semesters of that year, generally speaking. Over one thousand pupils were helped in the program.

Both oral and silent reading skills were tested, on a before-and-after basis, using the Wide Range Reading Test (oral) and the California Reading Test (silent). Gains averaging about 6 months were made during the first semester (that is, 4 months of instruction) while the average gain measured in the second semester was 7 months for silent reading and 9 months for oral reading, based on an average actual attendance of about 7 months. These results compare favorably with expected gains of about 5 months in 7 for disadvantaged pupils.

Personnel

Personnel for the program differed somewhat from first semester to second semester, on account of the change in schools already mentioned.

A. Project Director. (Part-time; normally the Supervisor of Reading Improvement of the Department of Special Education, Milwaukee Public Schools; M.A. and state license in special education; 20 years' experience in remedial reading.)

Together with the Supervising Teacher, the Project Director was responsible for selecting the schools, the pupils to attend the centers, and the teaching and other personnel. He undertook the in-service orientation of the project staff, ordered supplies, and wrote the necessary summary and progress reports and budgets.

B. Supervising Teacher. (Full-time; from the Department of Special Education, Milwaukee Public Schools; M.A. and state license in remedial reading; 16 years' teaching experience.)

The Supervising Teacher assisted the Project Director and also traveled a good deal from school to school to coordinate the centers and supervise activities.

C. Reading Teachers. (Full-time; two-thirds had the state license to teach remedial reading; 50 percent had Master's Degrees; and the average length of teaching experience for the group was about 12 years A few were Negro. All were selected on their ability to be flexible in approach, their willingness to cooperate in the program, and their previous experience in working with culturally deprived children.)

Primary responsibilities of the reading center teachers, in addition to working with project pupils on an intensive basis, included: 1) evaluation of reading and work-analysis skills, 2) testing, 3) preparation of materials and planning of activities and learning tasks for project pupils, 4) compilation of materials and development of techniques found to be especially suitable in working with this type of child, and 5) assistance in the collection of data. In addition, interaction with public school classroom teachers was maintained by the reading specialists in order to correlate the experiences of project pupils with ongoing classroom curriculum.

Methodology: General

The stated objectives of the program were:

1. To extend and expand reading center services for pupils in grades three through eight, public and non-public, who have evidenced difficulty in developing reading skills and are at least 1 year or more retarded in reading achievement with regard to their mental capacity.

2. To develop specific skills needed in the reading process

3. To develop within each child a feeling of confidence and to provide for the enjoyment of both the process and results of reading.

During the first semester the program operated in 13 of the 15 schools selected, on account of shortage of qualified personnel. At the beginning of the second semester only three of the 13 were retained, and 12 new schools were used. Generally public school children attended the centers in the morning and non-public in the afternoon, although non-public school children comprised only about 25 percent of the group served by the program.

The pupils attended the centers for varying periods, ranging from a few weeks to two semesters. As soon as they were reading at grade level in the judgment of the teacher (based chiefly on the California Reading Test), the pupils were released from the project. Others stayed only a short time in the centers before being transferred to other schools.

In the centers, a diagnostic approach was used to identify the specific needs of each pupil. Materials and equipment related to those needs were then used by the teachers, on an intensive basis since they taught the pupils in fairly homogeneous groups of six to eight for 30-35 minutes a day, 5 days a week. This contrasted with the normal classes of about 29-32 pupils.

The materials used included books of high-interest age but low-reading age, highly motivating games, and workbooks; audio-visual devices were also used. The way in which these items were used varied considerably from teacher to teacher.

Methodology: Specific Examples

A. The chief activities of each grade level in the program are listed below:

CHIEF ACTIVITIES OF EACH GRADE IN THE ELEMENTARY READING CENTERS

	First Part of Period	Second Part	Third Part
4	Sight vocabulary drill	Word recognition	Read stories
5	Word recognition	Reading stories	Comprehension training
6	Comprehension training	Reading stories	Word recognition
7	Comprehension training	Study skills	Speed reading
8	Comprehension training	Study skills	Use of references

B. The standard materials and equipment list for each center are reproduced here:

Books: Single library copies of

Coward-McCann	17 titles	C. B. Colby Books
Harr-Wagner	14 titles	Deep Sea Adventures, etc.
Random House	28 titles	Beginner Books
Steck-Vaughn	113 titles	High interest - low vocabulary
Franklin Watts	37 titles	First Books
Franklin Watts	14 titles	Let's Find Out About Books

Audio-visual equipment:

Carrels: Accousti-carrels - quantity varies from school to school
Filmstrips: 175 rolls - Eye-Gate House
Filmstrip projector: Graflex
Overhead projector: MMM Company
Overhead projector cart: Wilson
Projector screen: Radiant Wall Master
Tachisto - filmstrips and flasher: 5 programs - Learning Through Seeing
Tachisto - viewer: Learning Through Seeing
Tape recorder: Voice of Music
Thermo Fax copy machine

Materials:

Frostig program for the development of visual perception
Science Research Associates Reading Labs I, Ia, Ic, Elementary; Pilot Library IIIb; Reading for Understanding; Reading Accelerator - Model III
Sound and patterns of language lab - Holt, Rinehart & Winston
Transparencies (101 different) 2 boxes with carrying cases - Cambosco Creative Visuals

Evaluation

A. Measures of Achievement

The evaluation report (Milwaukee Public Schools, 1967) states that:

> Reading achievement was measured by reading center teachers in a random sample of all reading center par-

ticipants in eight project schools during the first semester and all reading center participants in project schools during the second semester. Students in the first semester sample were given the California Reading Test (silent reading) and the Wide Range (oral reading). These students were tested in September and again in January. This procedure yielded a total of 316 students who took both tests (pretest and posttest) in silent reading achievement and 318 students who took both tests in oral reading achievement. Of these totals 41 and 42 students respectively were from non-public schools.

The schools in the second-semester sample furnished similar data to the first-semester sample except that students were tested on the date when they entered the reading center and again on the date when they completed their instruction. That is, some of the students were in the reading center for two semesters, some for one semester, and a few for intermediate periods of time. The second-semester testing scheduled yielded 529 students who had taken both tests (pretest and posttest) in silent-reading achievement and 481 students who had taken both tests in oral achievement. The data were analyzed by computing the reading grade-equivalent when the student was pretested and again when posttested. A gain in reading grade-equivalent could then be determined by comparing these two scores. Mean gains in grade-equivalents were then determined, and these were compared to test norm data.

The results of the first semester testing are given in Table 1.

Table 1

FIRST-SEMESTER READING GAINS FOR
SAMPLES OF PUPILS IN THE READING CENTERS

Test Sample	Silent Reading N	Silent Reading Mean Gain	Oral Reading N	Oral Reading Mean Gain
Public School Pupils	274	0.65 years	277	0.61 years
Non-public School Pupils	42	0.60 years	41	1.18 years
Combined Samples	316	0.64 years	318	0.69 years

[Source: Table 2, p.13, Milwaukee Public Schools (1967]

The gains reflected in Table 1 are those obtained by pupils who had attended the centers for a maximum of 5 months, some less. Their expected gain, as underachievers, would be about .35 years in that period.

> The second semester data substantiate the findings in the first semester design. For this analysis the public and non-public children were not separated into groups for data analysis. The prime difference between the data from the two semesters is that many children in the second group were in the reading center for more than one semester. By actual tabulation, the mean reading-center attendance for the second group was 0.74 years (approximately 1 1/2 semesters). The mean gain in silent-reading achievement for this group was 0.76 years for the sample of 529 pupils, and the mean gain for oral-reading achievement was 0.89 years for 481 pupils.

These gains must be compared with expected gains for these pupils of about 0.50 years in that period of 0.74 years.

While no test of significance was possible with the data available, the considerable excess of actual over expected gain indicates the success of this program in providing measured benefits of cognitive achievement.

B. Other Evaluation Indices

A locally devised instrument was used to test changes in student attitude in three randomly selected centers in the first semester's program. No significant changes were detected.

The attitudes of a random sample of school personnel toward the program were tested by questionnaire. The results showed that these teachers felt the program was effective in areas related to reading, and that it complemented their own reading instruction.

C. Modifications and Suggestions

The program staff suggested that a more comprehensive and integrated program would be even more effective than this one. They thought that medical diagnosis of visual, auditory, and other defects would be desirable for the pupils before they entered the centers; that a social worker to visit homes of children with emotional problems in reading would help; and that a guidance counselor should be appointed for each center to maintain communication between the center and the pupil's classroom.

Budget

The total cost of the program in 1966-67 was about $130,000 not including overhead or evaluation costs. Of this sum about $2500 was spent on materials and equipment, but that figure takes into account amortization of equipment over 5 years. Accommodation was available in the schools, and not charged to the program.

To replicate the program would not necessarily cost the same, for obvious reasons. The number of centers established would determine the number of supervisory staff as well as of instructional personnel. The cost per child per year would probably be over $150.

Quoted Sources

* Milwaukee Public Schools. Strengthening reading services through increasing provisions for elementary reading centers. Milwaukee: Milwaukee Public Schools, Division of Curriculum and Instruction, 1967.

For More Information:

Mr. Melvin Yanow
5225 N. Vliet Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

---

* The Office of Education is collecting this material for placement in the ERIC system. Items may be obtained either in microfiche or hard copy.